



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

most important is that of Rufinus, which is more faithful than his translations of Origen's works, although in the longer speeches considerable liberties are taken. Rufinus' translation is here published on the basis of Caspari's edition. Adamantius enjoyed a singular revival in the sixteenth century, when no fewer than four new Latin translations of the dialogue were made — those of Picus, Perionius, Ferrarius, and Humfry. But the first edition of the Greek text did not appear until 1674, when the younger Wettstein published it from a manuscript no longer extant. In 1733 de la Rue included the dialogue in his edition of Origen's works, and Migne and Lommatzsch have added little to his work or that of Wettstein. There was thus a real need for a critical edition based on broader manuscript evidence and accompanied by an adequate introduction and apparatus of readings, and such an edition this newest volume of the Prussian Academy's series certainly is.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DAS TESTAMENT UNSERES HERRN UND DIE VERWANDTEN SCHRIFTEN. Von F. X. FUNK. (= "Forschungen zur christlichen Litteratur- und Dogmengeschichte." Herausgegeben von EHRHARD und KIRSCH. Zweiter Band. Erstes und zweites Heft.) Mainz: Kirchheim, 1901. Pp. xii+316. M. 16.

OF German scholars few were better prepared than Franz Xaver Funk, the Roman Catholic professor at Tübingen, successor to the well-known professor, afterward bishop, Hefele, to give a thoroughly intelligent verdict on the so-called "Testament of Our Lord," which has been introduced to the learned world with so much pretension by the Roman Catholic patriarch Rahmani of Antioch. As early as 1891 he had published a monograph of more than three hundred pages on the Apostolic Constitutions, with which the new document is closely connected, and never since has he lost sight of this kind of literature. Hence the title of the book: *Das Testament und die verwandten Schriften, i. e.*, the early Christian writings connected with it. The importance of Funk's book lies not so much in the elucidation he has given of the new text, as in the conclusions at which he arrives as to those kindred writings which have long been known. That the newly published Testament was not a work of the first or second century everyone saw at once, except the editor and the reviewer, as I see from the last page of Funk's book, in the *Dublin Review* (1900, pp. 245-74); and it does not matter much whether we refer it, with the bishop of

Salisbury,¹ to the school of Apollinaris of Laodicea, or, with Th. Zahn, of Erlangen, to the sect of the Kathari or Audians about the middle of the fourth century, or to some other time and place. But it is of the highest importance whether the so-called *canones Hippolyti* are an original work of the year 218 and the source of this whole sort of literature, as was stated by Hans Achelis, or whether they are the last and latest link in this chain, not attested before the twelfth century. This is the theory put forward by Funk in earlier writings and maintained in the present book.

According to Funk we get the following genealogy:

1. At the head stands AK VIII, *i. e.*, Book VIII of the Apostolic Constitutions, originating about 400, perhaps a little earlier.

2. On this depends AK VIII β , *i. e.*, its parallel texts, consisting of the five pieces:

a) Διδασκαλία τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων περὶ χαρισμάτων = AK VIII, 1, 2.

b) Διάταξις τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων περὶ χειροτονιῶν διὰ Ἰππολύτου = AK VIII, 4, 5, 16-28, 30, 31.

c) Παύλου τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου διατάξεις περὶ κανόνων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν = AK VIII, 32.

d) Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων διατάξεις = AK VIII, 33, 34, 42-45.

e) Περὶ εὐταξίας διδασκαλία πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων = AK VIII, 46.

3. A retouching of AK VIII β is KO, *i. e.*, the Egyptian Ecclesiastical Canons of the Holy Apostles (*ägyptische Kirchenordnung*).

4. Finally, on AK VIII β are based, on the one hand, T, the Testament as published by Rahmani, and KH, the canons of Hippolyt.

The present writer cannot claim to have made independent studies in this intricate complex, but much of what is said by Funk seems very probable. There are, however, points open to doubt. On p. 156 Funk compares the doxology in AK VIII, 5, διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου παιδὸς σου . . . δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα . . . ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, with the Latin translation of KO, per puerum tuum . . . per quem tibi gloria et potentia et honor patri et filio cum spiritu sancto, and he sees in the second an *editorial* alteration. But must this be the work of an *editor*? May it not be merely due to a copyist? In this very passage one MS. of the AK inserts μεθ' οὗ before δι' οὗ, and from T, 8, onward we have many variants of this sort in the AK themselves. An important review of the

¹ On p. 310 he is called "der Bischof J. Sarum von Salisbury (Dr. Wordsworth)." That continental Protestants are not acquainted with the titles of Anglican bishops is to be pardoned or excused; but to find such a misleading designation in the book of a Roman Catholic professor of church history is strange.

book of Funk, by Professor Drews, of Giessen, which appeared in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, No. 17, declares that all will agree with him that the Testament depends upon the Egyptian Ecclesiastical Canons of the Holy Apostles, but not in his main thesis as to the relation of the KO to KH. On the other hand, Drews concedes that the thesis of Achelis also will have to undergo many changes before it can be finally accepted.² Perhaps Drews is right also in the statement that it was still a little early to write a whole book on the Testament. A recent number of the *Journal of Theological Studies* publishes "A New Syriac Text of the Apocalyptic Part of the 'Testament of the Lord.'" This text was found by Rev. J. P. Arendzen, in Cod. Add. 2918 of the Cambridge University Library, and turns out to be an independent translation from the Greek. In one passage it has a sentence more than the text hitherto known. Before the sentence, in chap. viii, that in the West a king shall rise of another race, the sentence dropped out, apparently in consequence of homoioteleuton: kings there shall be reigning in the East, inglorious, thoughtless, not grown up, "boys, lovers of gold." Arendzen suggests that by the king in the West Alaric the Visigoth is meant; by the boy-kings in the East, Arcadius and Theodosius II. Whatever the final judgment proves to be, the investigations of Professor Funk will be an important help toward the formation of a sound judgment.

EB. NESTLE.

MAULBRONN, GERMANY.

DIE KIRCHENGESCHICHTE DES EUSEBIUS, aus dem Syrischen übersetzt von EBERHARD NESTLE. (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*; N. F., VI, 2.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901. Pp. x + 296. M. 9.50.

OF the versions of Eusebius' "Church History" the Syriac is confessedly the oldest. One of the two great manuscripts in which it is preserved, that in the British Museum, belongs to the sixth century; the other, which is at St. Petersburg, is dated 462 A. D., while what seems a reliable Armenian tradition refers the Armenian version, which was made from the Syriac, to the beginning of the fifth century. The Syriac version was thus made not later than the fourth century, and may even go back to the days of Eusebius himself. Its importance for the text of the church history is all the greater because the

²See on this question an article by J. P. BATIFFOL, "Les canons d'Hippolyte d'après des travaux récents," *Revue biblique*, Vol. X, No. 2.